

ten percent increase in your total employees. It is substantially restricted from where the State of Nebraska is in LB 270 and it is too high and the Ashford amendment, while it moves the number down, is not the right figure. Going to vote for it, it is \$500 to the good. That does not go far enough and does not placate me as far as making 270 a good bill.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. An amendment, please.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Conway would move to amend his own amendment by striking \$1,500 and inserting \$1,000.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Conway, please.

SENATOR CONWAY: Mr. Speaker and members of the body, I'm not going to spend a great deal of time. The issue has been addressed relative to the Chizek amendment originally. The whole idea of the amount of credit has been discussed relative to my initial amendment which was 1,200 which I thought that the general supporters of the bill had agreed to and then they amended that up to 15, and so the auction is on. I'm offering the \$1,000 amendment, in a sense, to put the thing into some kind of a rational basis that that would be double the 500 that we currently have. And I think also under consideration is a major change we're making over the original 1124 and that change basically was, 1124, that that tax credit could only be applied to income tax liability, whereas with the change we've got now we're also including sales tax. In many cases that original \$500 may have actually been a wasted credit because someone who has made \$100,000 investment in their business probably is in a situation where the investment in and of itself created enough sheltering of income in that given year that it might not have even had a liability enough to use the credit. It is like going to the sales tax, that is going to be a definite credit absolute at the time that they actually enter into this agreement. They were going to get the \$500 now under the amended version, \$1,500 which I think is really too much and I would like to see the bill passed but I also think that we're in a situation where, if we get too hoggy over the amount of money, we're ultimately going to lose the whole bill, lose the concept and I think that, if I remember right, I believe there are some provisions that would put us in a situation where we're actually going to end up with maybe either an actual negative net value when we're done with this thing if we actually lost the bill and lost the concept under 1124, and some positive changes that we have included in the bill under the Chizek amendment. So, with that